

## Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00638 01 OF 04 171701Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-07 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-02 PM-04 PRS-01  
SAJ-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /103 W  
----- 046531 /55

R 171527Z DEC 76  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1905  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION NATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

UNCLAS SECTION 1 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0638

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: N/A  
TAGS: PARM, NATO  
SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: DE VOS DECEMBER 16, 1976 WESTERN PRESS  
CONFERENCE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

FOLLOWING ARE Q'S AND A'S OF AMBASSADOR DE VOS END OF ROUND  
PRESS CONFERENCE DECEMBER 16:

1. Q. (DIE PRESSE) MR. AMBASSADOR, YOU SAID OUT OF THIS  
COMMUNIQUE THAT THE WESTERN SIDE HAS TABLED NEW FIGURES.  
ON PAGE SIX YOU ARE SAYING THAT ACCORDING TO WESTERN  
ASSESSMENTS, THE DISPARITY IN GROUND MANPOWER IS IN  
ERROR -- IN FAVOR OF THE EAST -- SOMEWHAT LARGER THAN  
150,000 MEN. WAS THIS PART ABSOLUTELY NEW? WE KNEW  
IT BEFORE; AS THE WESTERN SIDE ALWAYS SAID THAT THE  
DISPARITY WAS SOMEWHAT OF 150,000. NOW WHY DID YOU  
TABLE NEW FIGURES? ARE THEY NEW, OR TO WHICH EXTENT  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00638 01 OF 04 171701Z

ARE THEY NEW? DID THEY INCLUDE FOR INSTANCE, TANKS,  
ETC?

A. WELL, AS THE STATEMENT SAYS THEY ONLY REFER TO MANPOWER.  
AS YOU SAY, THE ORDER OF MAGNITUDE IS THE SAME AS THE  
FIGURES WHICH WE ORIGINALLY SUBMITTED, BUT WE HAVE

BROUGHT THESE FIGURES UP TO DATE NOW. THEY WERE SUBMITTED IN 1973, AND WE HAVE NOW SUBMITTED THE LATEST FIGURES. OF OURSE, THERE ARE ALWAYS MINOR FLUCTUATIONS, AND WE HAVE NOW SUBMITTED OUR ESTIMATES AS OF THE 1ST OF JANUARY 1976.

2. Q. (DIE PRESSE) DID YOU SUBMIT ESTIMATES OF THE EASTERN SIDE AS WELL?

A. I BEG YOUR PARDON.

Q. DID YOU TABLE ESTIMATES OF THE EASTERN SIDE AS WELL?

A. WE DID NOT TABLE NEW FIGURES FOR THE EASTERN SIDE AT THIS MOMENT. WE HAVE TABLED FIGURES FOR THEM IN 1973 AT THE SAME TIME WE SUBMITTED OUR DATA ON WESTERN FORCES, AND WE HAVE TOLD THE EAST THAT OUR MOST RECENT COMPUTATIONS STILL REFLECT THE SAME ORDER OF MAGNITUDE AS THE ORIGINAL ONES. THAT IS WHY THE DISPARITIES, OF COURSE, REMAIN THE SAME.

3. Q. (PRAVDA) (DELIVERED IN GERMAN) THE WESTERN SIDE HAS TABLED ITS DATA. BUT WHY DID THE NATO COUNTRIES WAIT SIX MONTHS?

A. WELL, WE MAKE OUR OWN SCHEDULES. WE HAVE SUBMITTED OUR ORIGINAL FIGURES IN 1973, AND WE HAVE KEPT OUR EASTERN COLLEAGUES INFORMED ABOUT THE FACT THAT THERE WAS NO MAJOR CHANGE IN THESE FIGURES. THEY HAVE BEEN BETTER INFORMED THAN WE WERE FOR SOME THREE YEARS, BETWEEN 1973 AND THE DATE OF JUNE OF 1976, WHEN FOR THE FIRST TIME WE HEARD THE EASTERN ESTIMATES.  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00638 01 OF 04 171701Z

4. Q. (PRINCE - ASSOCIATED PRESS) MR. AMBASSADOR, COULD YOU GIVE US AN IDEA AS TO WHAT THE DISCREPANCIES ACTUALLY AMOUNT TO IN RESPECT THAT THE WESTERN ESTIMATES OF THE EASTERN (UNCLEAR) AND VICE VERSA?

A. I AM SORRY. I PREFER NOT TO GO INTO THAT KIND OF DETAIL ON THE DATA AT THIS MOMENT. THESE ARE PART OF CONFIDENTIAL DISCUSSIONS WHICH WE HAVE TO HAVE WITH THE OTHER SIDE, THE EASTERN SIDE IN THE NEXT ROUND AND I HOPE YOU WILL UNDERSTAND THAT I WOULD PREFER NOT TO GO INTO THIS HERE IN THIS FORUM.

5. Q. (WIELAND - REUTERS) MR. AMBASSADOR, I HAVE SEVERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DATA ISSUE. THE FIRST ONE OF WHICH IS A RELATIVELY EFFECTIVE ONE. I WONDER IF YOU COULD EXPLAIN TO US THE SIGNIFICANCE OF YOUR SAYING IN YOUR STATEMENT THAT THE WEST TABLED FIGURES DURING THE PRESENT

ROUND, WHEN WE WERE TOLD A FEW MINUTES AGO, THAT THEY WERE PRESENTED THIS MORNING. I WONDERED WHETHER THERE IS ANY PARTICULAR SIGNIFICANCE IN THIS, AND SECONDLY, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT CRITERIA YOU COULD HAVE USED IF YOU HAVE NOT IN FACT PRESENTED UP-DATED FIGURES ON EASTERN MANPOWER, WHAT CRITERIA YOU HAVE USED IN ASSESSING THAT THE DISPARITY IS SOMEWHAT LARGER THAN 150,000 MEN. MY THIRD QUESTION ON THIS IS: I NOTICE ON THIS YOU SAY THAT IT ISN'T CLEAR ON WHAT BASIS THE EAST HAS USED IN COMPUTING ITS DATA. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK WHETHER THE WEST HAS USED THE SAME CRITERIA IN PRODUCING ITS DATA AS OF JANUARY 1, 1976 AS IT DID IN NOVEMBER 1973? IS THE BASIS THE SAME? ARE ALL THE COMPONENTS INCLUDED IN 1973 INCLUDED IN THE LATEST DATA?

A. FOR THE FIRST QUESTION, IT IS TRUE THAT THIS MORNING WE GAVE THE OFFICIAL CONFIRMATION IN THE PLENARY SESSION OF THESE ESTIMATES, THESE FIGURES. WE HAVE IN FACT UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00638 01 OF 04 171701Z

GIVEN THEM RATHER RECENTLY TO THE OTHER SIDE, SOMEWHAT BEFORE THIS.

Q. (WIELAND) INFORMALLY?

A. YES. - AS TO THE SECOND QUESTION I DIDN'T QUITE UNDERSTAND.

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00638 02 OF 04 171702Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-07 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-02 PM-04 PRS-01  
SAJ-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /103 W  
----- 046555 /55

R 171527Z DEC 76  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1906  
SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

UNCLAS SECTION 2 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0638

FROM US REP MBFR

6. Q. (WIELAND) AS FAR AS EASTERN DATA, WHAT CRITERIA DID YOU USE?

A. WE HAVE OUR OWN COMPUTATIONS ON THIS AND THEY MORE OR LESS CONFIRM THE ORIGINAL FIGURES. AS I SAID, THEY ARE OF THE SAME ORDER OF MAGNITUDE AND SINCE THE SAME IS THE CASE WITH THE FIGURES FOR WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO REMAINS THE SAME, SOMEWHAT IN EXCESS OF 150,000. AS TO THE THIRD QUESTION. INDEED, WE USED BASICALLY THE SAME CRITERIA IN 1973 AS WE DID NOW. AS I SAID IN THE STATEMENT WE INCLUDED ALL ACTIVE DUTY UNIFORMED MILITARY PERSONNEL, EXCEPTING NAVY WHICH WE AGREED IN THE PRELIMINARY TALKS NOT TO INCLUDE IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

7. Q. (WIELAND) AS THE FIGURES, MR. AMBASSADOR, WERE WIDELY UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00638 02 OF 04 171702Z

CIRCULATED IN 1973 AND I THINK EVEN CONFIRMED AT SOME PRESS CONFERENCES WHICH YOU AND YOUR PREDECESSORS HAVE HAD ABOUT 777,000 ON THE NATO SIDE. WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE ORDER OF MAGNITUDE ON THE NATO SIDE REMAINS ROUGHLY THE SAME?

A. THAT IS RIGHT.

(WIELAND) ROUGHLY THE SAME?

A. THAT IS RIGHT. ROUGHLY THE SAME.

8. Q. (WIELAND) CAN I ASK JUST ONE LAST QUESTION. CAN YOU TELL ME IN THE NATO COMPUTATION WHICH FORCES, WHICH COUNTRIES ARE INCLUDED IN THE NATO TOTAL FIGURE?

A. WELL, THE FIGURES OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

(WIELAND) ON THE WESTERN SIDE?

A. YES, ON THE WESTERN SIDE.

(WIELAND) THEY DO NOT INCLUDE THE FIGURES OF FRANCE?

A. NO.

9. Q. (IZVESTIA) (PARAPHRASE) COULD YOU SAY HOW YOU CALCULATE YOUR FIGURES IN TERMS OF DISTRIBUTION OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE TWO SIDES. IS IT JUST THAT YOU SAY HOW MANY MEN THERE ARE OR DO YOU TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION HOW THE STRENGTH OF BOTH SIDES IS? DO YOU SAY, FOR EXAMPLE, TANKS AND YOU SAY 500 AIRPLANES IN THE REGION OR DO YOU TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION HOW THEY MAKE THE SITUATION IN THE REGION?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00638 02 OF 04 171702Z

A. WELL, THESE FIGURES EXCLUSIVELY RELATE TO MANPOWER OF THE TWO SIDES: ACTIVE DUTY, MILITARY MANPOWER, PEOPLE WHO ARE ACTUALLY SERVING IN THE FORCES ON BOTH SIDES. AND WE ALWAYS USE IDENTICAL CRITERIA, OF COURSE, IN COUNTING THE FIGURES FOR THE EASTERN SIDE AND FOR THE WESTERN SIDE. WHEN WE LOOK AT THE TOTALS WE COME TO THIS DISPARITY, AS WE CALL IT, OF ABOUT 150,000 MEN --SOMEWHAT MORE THAN 150,000 MEN, IN FAVOR OF THE EASTERN SIDE.

10. Q. (IZVESTIA) (FOLLOW-UP QUESTION) (PARAPHRASE) ABOUT THIS DISPARITY: THE SUGGESTION OF THE WEST FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF A SOVIET TANK ARMY ON THE EAST AND NOT ANY WHOLE UNIT ON THE WESTERN SIDE FORCES.

A. WELL, IT IS FULLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH OUR BASIC APPROACH TO THESE NEGOTIATIONS, OUR BASIC POSITION AND IT IS THAT THESE NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD DEAL -- WE HAVE BEEN GIVEN THE TASK HERE TO ENHANCE STABILITY -- SO WE FEEL YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT THE POTENTIALLY UNSTABLE FACTORS IN THE SECURITY SITUATION. ONE THING THAT REALLY STRIKES THE EYE IS THIS LARGE DISPARITY FAVORING THE WARSAW PACT IN THE AREA AS REGARDS GROUND FORCE MANPOWER AND TANKS. AND TO REMOVE THAT DISPARITY WE HAVE PROPOSED TO MOVE IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS TOWARD AGREEMENT WHICH WOULD PROVIDE FOR A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING IN MANPOWER AND A CERTAIN REDUCTION OF THE LARGE SUPERIORITY WHICH THE WARSAW PACT HAS IN THE AREA AS REGARDS MAIN BATTLE TANKS. FROM THAT POSITION, FLOWS OUR PROPOSAL TO REDUCE ON THE EASTERN SIDE A SOVIET TANK ARMY. OF COURSE, WE HAVE MADE SINCE THEN ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS. ONE YEAR AGO, AS I RECALLED IN THE STATEMENT, WE ADDED ON OUR SIDE APART FROM THE REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS WE PREVIOUSLY OFFERED AS FAR AS GROUND

FORCES ON THE WESTERN SIDE IS CONCERNED, A VERY SIGNIFICANT  
REDUCTION AND LIMITATION COMMITMENT CONCERNING THE UNITED  
STATES NUCLEAR SYSTEMS. WE HAVE TO LOOK AT THESE  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00638 02 OF 04 171702Z

PROPOSALS IN THEIR TOTALITY AND AS I ALSO TRIED TO  
EXPLAIN IN THE STATEMENT NOT ONLY LOOK AT THE REDUCTIONS  
THEMSELVES AND AT THE LIMITATIONS THEMSELVES BUT ALSO  
AT THE ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH THEY TAKE PLACE AND ALL OF THE  
RELEVANT FACTORS WHICH ARE INVOLVED. ONE OF THE MOST RELEVANT  
FACTORS IS, OF COURSE, THE GEOGRAPHICAL FACTOR. THE SOVIET  
UNION, WHICH IS THE MILITARY SUPER-POWER ON THE EASTERN  
SIDE WHICH IS IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO THE REDUCTION AREA  
WHICH HAS ENORMOUS FORCES ON ITS TERRITORY WHICH ARE VERY  
WELL EQUIPPED, WHOSE ARMAMENTS ARE CONSTANTLY MODERNIZED.  
AND AS A RESULT OF AN AGREEMENT HERE THERE WILL BE NO  
LIMITATION ON THE SIZE OF THESE FORCES IN THE SOVIET UNION.  
THOSE ARE ALL FACTORS WHICH ARE VERY RELEVANT TO THE  
SITUATION WHICH HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT WHEN  
YOU JUDGE NEGOTIATING PROPOSALS.

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00638 03 OF 04 171707Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-07 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-02 PM-04 PRS-01  
SAJ-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /103 W  
----- 046652 /55

R 171527Z DEC 76  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1907  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION NATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

UNCLAS SECTION 3 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0638

FROM US REP MBFR

11. Q. (CBS - REED) MR. AMBASSADOR, I NOTICE YOU BROUGHT UP THIS ELEMENT OF GEOGRAPHICAL ADVANTAGE. THE EAST SEEMS TO ALWAYS IMPLY THAT THIS QUESTION HAS ALREADY BEEN SETTLED. IS THAT TRUE?

A. NO. THE ONLY THING WHICH WAS SETTLED IN THE PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION WAS THAT WE WOULD CONSIDER ACTUAL REDUCTIONS IN THE AREA OF CENTRAL EUROPE -- WHICH WAS NOT COMPLETELY DEFINED IN THE PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS ONLY A GENERAL INDICATION THAT CENTRAL EUROPE WOULD BE THE AREA ON WHICH WE WOULD FOCUS.

Q. (INTERJECTION: BUT ITS STILL AN OPEN QUESTION, BOTH SIDES ...)

A. THE PROPOSALS OF BOTH SIDES ARE TO A CERTAIN EXTENT COINCIDING AS FAR AS THE AREA IS CONCERNED. BOTH SIDES UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00638 03 OF 04 171707Z

PROPOSED THAT THIS AREA WOULD COMPRISE THE GDR, CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND POLAND ON THE EASTERN SIDE AND THE BENELUX AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY ON THE WESTERN SIDE. THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY -- AS YOU WILL RECALL-- IS STILL OPEN AS FAR AS WE ARE CONCERNED. BUT WHAT, OF COURSE, WE DIDNOT AGREE IN THE PRELIMINARY TALKS IS THAT WE WOULD CONSIDER THIS AREA IN COMPLETE ISOLATION. THAT WE WOULD IGNORE EVERYTHING WHICH IS RELEVANT WHICH IS ADJACENT TO THE AREA. AND IT IS OBVIOUS THAT IN ANY REDUCTION AGREEMENT -- TO JUDGE THE IMPLICATION OF ANY REDUCTION AGREEMENT -- YOU CANNOT IGNORE WHAT IS HAPPENING IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT AROUND THE AREA -- SO IT IS OBVIOUS THAT IN THIS RESPECT WE HAVE TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THAT FACTOR, ESPECIALLY THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTOR; IT IS A VERY IMPORTANT FACTOR. THE SOVIET UNION IS THE MAJOR POWER ON THE EASTERN SIDE AND IS CLOSE BY AND WOULD NOT BE UNDER ANY LIMITATIONS AS REGARDS THE SIZE OF ITS FORCES ON ITS TERRITORY.

12. Q. (TASS) WOULD YOU LIKE TO CHARACTERIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FIGURES? DO YOU THINK THAT THESE FIGURES WOULD PLAY THE PRINCIPAL ROLE DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS OR DO YOU THINK THEY ARE A HELP IN THE NEGOTIATIONS? AND DO YOU THINK THAT THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS MUST FIRST OF ALL SOLVE THE KEY QUESTIONS?

A. WELL, FIGURES ARE CERTAINLY IMPORTANT AND WE ALWAYS STATED THAT FROM OUR SIDE. WE STARTED OUT THESE

NEGOTIATIONS BY PUTTING OUR FIGURES ON THE TABLE. WE HAVE ALWAYS THOUGHT THAT TO JUDGE THE IMPLICATIONS OF POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS YOU HAVE TO KNOW WHAT FACTS THEY ARE BASED ON. AND REDUCTION COMMITMENTS AND LIMITATION COMMITMENTS HAVE TO BE EXPRESSED IN CONCRETE NUMBERS. SO WE THINK IT VERY IMPORTANT THAT THESE NEGOTIATIONS ARE NOW PUT ON A MORE FACTUAL LEVEL BY THE FACT THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAS NOW ALSO GIVEN US SOME OF THEIR FIGURES.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00638 03 OF 04 171707Z

OF COURSE, THAT'S NOT THE ONLY THING WE HAVE ALSO TO RESOLVE SOME PRINCIPLE QUESTIONS. ON THE BASIS OF THE CONCLUSION OF THE DATA DISCUSSION YOU HAVE STILL TO RESOLVE THE PRINCIPAL ISSUES ON WHICH WE ARE FAR APART YET AND THAT'S WHY IT IS SO IMPORTANT -- WE CONSIDER IT SO IMPORTANT -- THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD NOW FINALLY START TO MOVE TO RESPOND TO THIS VERY IMPORTANT PROPOSAL WHICH WE HAVE MADE LAST YEAR, IN WHICH WE THINK WE SHOWED THE WAY IN WHICH WE COULD MOVE FORWARD THROUGH AN EQUITABLE AND PRACTICAL METHOD FOR BRIDGING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES. AND WE VERY MUCH HOPE OF COURSE FOR THAT RASON THAT A POSITIVE AND SERIOUS RESPONSE FROM THE EASTERN SIDE TO THOSE PROPOSALS WILL BE COMING FORWARD.

13. Q. (REUTERS) MR. AMBASSADOR, I WONDER IF TO HELP OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THIS MATTER YOU COULD DISCLOSE THE FIGURES YOU TABLED ON THE WESTERN SIDE, OR AT LEAST -- YOU TALKED IN TERMS OF MINOR FLUCTUATIONS -- CAN YOU TELL US, GIVE US SOME INDICATION OF THE PERCENTAGE CHANGE ON EITHER SIDE. AFTER ALL, IT'S A LONG TIME SINCE YOUR LAST FIGURES WERE PRESENTED. CAN YOU GIVE US SOME INDICATION UP OR DOWN?

A. I WOULD PREFER NOT TO GIVE ANY SPECIFIC FIGURES OR EVEN PERCENTAGES BECAUSE AS I SAID WE ATTACH MUCH IMPORTANCE TO CONFIDENTIALITY. WE SAY THERE ARE LARGE DISCREPANCIES -- THERE ARE TWO TERMS: DISCREPANCIES AND DISPARITIES -- DISPARITIES ARE THESE GAPS BETWEEN THE EASTERN FORCES AND THE WESTERN FORCES AS WE SEE IT AND DISCREPANCIES REFER TO THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ESTIMATES WEHAVE OF THE EASTERN FORCES AND THE FIGURES THE EAST HAS GIVEN US ON THEIR OWN FORES. THESE DISCREPANCIES ARE LARGE AND IMPORTANT; WE WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THIS. THIS IS OBVIOUSLY STILL A DELICATE PROBLEM AND WE WOULD LIKE TO MAINTAIN CONFIDENTIALITY

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED



PAGE 04 MBFR V 00638 03 OF 04 171707Z

AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE. ON BOTH SIDES THERE HAS BEEN A  
VERY SLIGHT INCREASE. THAT IS A MATTER OF COMPUTATION --  
MORE REFINED COMPUTATION -- WE CONSIDER IT.

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00638 04 OF 04 171710Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-07 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-02 PM-04 PRS-01  
SAJ-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /103 W  
----- 046668 /55

R 171527Z DEC 76  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1908  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION NATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

UNCLAS SECTION 4 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0638

FROM US REP MBFR

14. Q. (REUTERS) MAY I JUST ASK A SECOND QUESTION IN ORDER  
TO UNDERSTAND THIS: IF ON YOUR GROUND FORCE FIGURES,  
IF THE FRENCH FORCES ARE NOT INCLUDED, WOULD THIS NOT  
SUGGEST THAT THE NATO GROUND FORCE FIGURE HAD IN  
FACT BEEN REDUCED.

A. THE THING IS THAT THE DATA FOR THE WESTERN DIRECT  
PARTICIPANTS HAVE REMAINED ESSENTIALLY THE SAME EXCEPT  
THAT THERE IS A SLIGHT INCREASE DUE TO OUR MORE REFINED  
COMPUTATIONS.

15. Q. (UNIDENTIFIED) JUST TO FOLLOW UP ON THIS: IF YOU SAID  
THERE HAS BEEN A MODEST INCREASE ON BOTH SIDES, DOESN'T  
THIS CONTRADICT PREVIOUS WESTERN CLAIMS THAT THERE HAS  
BEEN A SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN TROOPS AND ARMAMENTS ON  
THE EASTERN SIDE.

16. Q. SO IN THE ACTUAL REDUCTION AREA THERE HAS NOT BEEN A  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00638 04 OF 04 171710Z

SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE ON THE PART OF THE WARWAW PACT?  
A. THERE HAS BEEN AN INCREASE, LIKE ON OUR SIDE, IN THE  
COMPUTATIONS. LET ME MAKE THAT CLEAR, I DO NOT WANT TO  
SUGGEST THAT THEY HAVE BEEN REALLY INCREASING THEIR FORCES  
IN THE AREA IN A BIG WAY. THERE HAS BEEN SLIGHT DIFFERENCE IN  
THE COMPUTATION OR CALCULATION.

17. Q. (REUTERS) MR. AMBASSADOR, IN THE PAST YOU HAVE LAID  
VERY GREAT STRESS ON THE DISPARITY IN FAVOR OF THE  
SOCIALIST COUNTRIES IN TERMS OF MAIN BATTLE TANKS. I  
THINK THIS HAS BEEN AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT IN THE WESTERN  
POSITION. THIS TIME YOU APPEAR TO HAVE CONFINED  
TO MANPOWER FIGURES. DO THOSE TANK FIGURES STILL  
RELEVANT?

A. THEY REMAIN VERY RELEVANT TO OUR POSITION. WE  
ARE NOW AT THE STAGE WHERE THE EAST HAS PROVIDED MANPOWER  
FIGURES AND SO WE HOPE TO DISCUSS THESE.

18. Q. (NBC-HOFFER) MR. AMBASSADOR, A BASIC QUESTION:  
YOU'VE BEEN HERE THREE YEARS NOW AND THE WHOLE SITUATION  
SEEMS BASICALLY THE SAME. YOU ARE STILL TALKING ABOUT  
FIGURES, DISCREPANCIES--MR. OESER WAS HERE A FEW  
MOMENTS AGO AND SAID YOUR FIGURES ALSO DIDN'T LOOK TOO  
GOOD; HE SAW A DISCREPANCY THERE. AND HE ALSO INDICATED  
THERE MIGHT BE THOUGHT TO CHANGING THE ENTIRE MODEL OF  
THE TALKS. HE REFERRED TO SOME STATEMENTS BY  
SOCIALIST POLITICIANS IN THE WESTERN WORLD. HAVE YOU  
EVER GIVEN ANY THOUGHT TO CHANGING THE MODEL OF THE  
TALKS OR THE APPROACH ITSELF TOO IS INCOMPATIBLE. THE  
WAY THESE TALKS ARE SET UP YOU WILL NEVER COME TO  
RESOLVE...

A. OUR POSITION IS QUITE CLEAR. IF YOU LOOK AT THE  
COMMUNIQUE OF THE NATO MINISTERS LAST WEEK, YOU WILL FIND  
IT CONFIRMED IN VERY CLEAR TERMS. THE WESTERN  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00638 04 OF 04 171710Z

PARTICIPANTS THINK THESE NEGOTIATIONS CAN ACHIEVE THEIR  
OBJECTIVE OF ENHANCING STABILITY AND STRENGTHENING  
PEACE AND SECURITY IN EUROPE, ONLY THROUGH THE  
ESTABLISHMENT OF PARITY IN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER AND THE  
REDUCTION OF THE MAIN BATTLE TANK DISPARITY WHICH NOW

FAVORS THE EAST TO SUCH A LARGE EXTENT. TO GAIN EASTERN ACCEPTANCE TO THAT APPROACH, WE MADE THESE ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS AT THE END OF THE LAST YEAR AND THAT IS OUR POSITION. I WOULD NOT COMMENT ON STATEMENTS MADE BY INDIVIDUAL POLITICAL SPOKESMEN IN SOME COUNTRIES-- THAT'S NOT MY BUSINESS HERE-- AS YOU KNOW WE ARE DEFENDING A COMMON NATO AGREED POSITION AND AS A SPOKESMAN FOR THE GROUP OF NATO PARTICIPANTS IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS, I CAN ONLY POINT OUT THAT THIS POSITION WAS CONFIRMED ONLY LAST WEEK BY THE MINISTERS MEETING AT THE NATO COUNCIL.

19. Q. (APA-ALTSCHUL) I'M SORRY, I DIDN'T QUITE UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU SAID ABOUT THE SLIGHT INCREASE ON BOTH SIDES ON THE NUMBERS AND FIGURES GIVEN. ALRIGHT, THERE'S A SLIGHT INCREASE AS FAR AS YOUR DATA ARE CONCERNED COMPARED TO 1973. BUT THE EASTERN SIDE HAS ONLY GIVEN ONCE THE DATA; WHERE FROM DO YOU READ THE SLIGHT INCREASE?

A. FROM OUR COMPUTATIONS.

A. (FOLLOW-UP) FROM YOUR OWN INFORMATION; BUT NOT FROM DATA...

A. WE GAVE FIGURES ON EASTERN MANPOWER IN 1973 AND WE HAVE KEPT THESE FIGURES UNDER REVIEW, WE ARE OF COURSE, TRYING TO REFINE, IMPROVE OUR COUNTING METHODS ALL THE TIME. AND ON THE BASIS OF THOSE REFINED COMPUTATIONS WHICH WE HAVE NOW THERE HAS BEEN A SLIGHT INCREASE.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00638 04 OF 04 171710Z

20. Q. (REUTERS) THERE HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED FIGURES, I THINK DURING THE LAST YEAR, WHICH HAVE UPGRADED THE 777,000 FIGURE ON THE NATO SIDE TO AROUND 800,000. WOULD YOU SAY THIS IS A FAIR ASSESSMENT OF THE ORDER OF MAGNITUDE THAT YOU HAD IN MIND?

A. NO; THAT WOULD REFLECT TOO HIGH AN INCREASE.

Q. THAT'S TOO HIGH-- 800,000 IS TOO HIGH?

A. SO NOW, I'VE GIVEN YOU MAYBE ENOUGH INDICATION HOW SMALL THE INCREASE REALLY IS.

Q. (REUTERS) BUT 925,000 IS STILL ABOUT RIGHT ON THE OTHER SIDE?

A. NO. THERE HAS BEEN AN INCREASE IN THE FIGURE FOR THEIR

SIDE AS WELL.RESOR

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** TEXT, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, PRESS CONFERENCES, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 17 DEC 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** n/a  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** n/a  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:**  
**Disposition Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976MBFRV00638  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D760464-1142  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t19761233/aaaabcne.tel  
**Line Count:** 602  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 11  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** schwenja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 24 MAY 2004  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <24 MAY 2004 by hattaycs>; APPROVED <30 AUG 2004 by schwenja>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: DE VOS DECEMBER 16, 1976 WESTERN PRESS CONFERENCE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOLLOWING ARE Q'S AND A'S OF AMBASSADOR DE VOS END  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006